



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,297	08/01/2003	Prakash Sikchi	MSI-1558US	3701
22801	7590	05/25/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/25/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/632,297	SIKCHI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Laurie Ries	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38, 39 and 51-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38, 39 and 51-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/9/07.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 8 March 2007, to the Original Application, filed 1 August 2003.
2. The rejection of claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, and 38-49 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Altova, Inc., "XML Spy 4.0 Manual," Altova Inc. & Altova GmbH, copyright 1998-2001, chapters 1, 2, and 6, encompassing pages 1-17, 18-90, and 343-362, respectively, [hereinafter "XML Spy"], has been withdrawn, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38-39, and 51-59 are pending. Claims 13-14, 16, 37, and 40-49 have been cancelled. Claims 51-59 have been added. Claim 50 is not listed. Claims 1, 15, 17, 29, 30, 31, and 34 are independent claims.

Request for Continued Examination

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

Art Unit: 2176

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 December 2006 has been entered.

Claim Objections

5. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claim number 50 has been omitted from the listing of claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38-39, and 50-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams ("BizTalk Unleashed") in view of Vasters ("BizTalk Server 2000 A Beginner's Guide").

As per independent claim 1, Adams teaches a method for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document, using the BizTalk Mapper application (See Adams, Pages 110-112).

Adams also teaches, in a first phase, annotation logic for modifying the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of document of the first kind and associated parts of documents of the second kind, the first phase producing a modified translation file, such as creating a BizTalk map that associates the fields of the first document to the related fields of the second document, creating an XSLT translation file (See Adams, Pages 109-123).

Adams also teaches, in a second phase, using the modified translation or XSLT file to convert the input document into the output document (See Adams, Pages 45-49), including activating the mapping functionality by testing the BizTalk map with entered data values (See Adams, Page 125), and using the mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document, such as a reference associated a student score percent in an input document with a student grade percent in an output document (See Adams, Page 125, Figure 5.18).

Adams does not teach expressly providing a translation file that converts document of the first kind to documents of the second kind (emphasis added).

Vasters teaches that Microsoft BizTalk Mapper is used to transform documents in a native format (See Vasters, Page 360, "BizTalk Mapper"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include separate kinds of documents to be transformed, providing the benefit of allowing related data to be exchanged among applications requiring different data types.

Adams and Vasters are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of mapping documents using Microsoft BizTalk Mapper.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the conversion of different types of documents of Vasters with the document translation method of Adams. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vasters with Adams for the benefit of allowing the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

As per dependent claim 2, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the first kind of document is a markup language document that uses tags pertaining to subject matter fields in the input document, such as an XML document (See Adams, Page 113).

As per dependent claim 3, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 2 as described above. Adams also teaches that the first kind of document is an XML document (See Adams, Page 113).

As per dependent claim 4, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the second kind of document, or output document, is serialized into its native format (See Adams, Page 110). It was well known at the time of the invention that a document having visual features could be saved in a markup language format, such as HTML. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to format the output document in HTML format, providing the benefit of allowing the document to be displayed to users at various locations on a typical device used to display HTML documents, such as an Internet browser.

As per dependent claim 5, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 4 as described above. Adams also teaches that the resulting output document is serialized into its native format (See Adams, Page 110). It was well known at the time of the invention that a document having visual features could be saved in an HTML format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to format the output document in HTML format, providing the benefit of

allowing the document to be displayed to users at various locations on a typical device used to display HTML documents, such as an Internet browser.

As per dependent claim 6, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. While Adams and Vasters do not teach expressly that the output document includes an electronic form having at least one data entry field therein, Adams does teach that the resulting output document is serialized into its native format (See Adams, Page 110). It was well known at the time of the invention that a document containing an electronic form could be saved in an HTML format. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to format the output document in HTML format, providing the benefit of allowing the document to be displayed to users at various locations on a typical device used to display HTML documents, such as an Internet browser. Adams also teaches that the fields of the output document are mapped to corresponding parts of the input document via at least one reference (See Adams, Pages 109-123).

As per dependent claim 7, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. While Adams and Vasters do not teach expressly receiving information input by a user into a data entry field, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that files may be updated by a user inputting data into a data field. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include updated data as entered by a user, providing the benefit of mapping the most recent version of data in order to produce a correct and relevant output file.

Adams also teaches modifying corresponding parts of an input document pointed to by a reference in response to receiving an update to the input document (See Adams, Page 116, "Updating the Source or Destination Specification").

As per dependent claim 8, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the translation file is expressed in a stylesheet format, such as XSL (See Adams, Pages 45-49).

As per dependent claim 9, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 8 as described above. Adams also teaches that the modifying of the translation file includes adding extension features to the translation file expressed in the XSL, such as using functoids to transform data (See Adams, Page 115).

As per dependent claim 10, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Adams also teaches that the activating of the mapping functionality includes calling the extension functions to return the references that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document, such as calling the functoids to perform various data transformations (See Adams, Page 120-123).

As per dependent claim 11, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches adding the mapping functionality at locations in the translation file that mark context changes in the output document, such as defining the number of occurrences of repeating data fields in the output document (See Adams, Page 114-116 and Figure 5.4).

As per dependent claim 12, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches adding the mapping functionality at locations

in the translation file that mark data items contained in the input document that are to be bound to corresponding parts in the output document (See Adams, Page 115, Figure 5.5).

As per independent claim 15, Adams teaches a method for generating mapping functionality that can map between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document (See Adams, Pages 110-112). Claim 15 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

As per independent claim 17, Adams teaches an apparatus for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document (See Adams, Pages 110-112, including Figure 5.1).

Adams also teaches annotation logic configured to modify the translation file to include mapping functionality that can provide information regarding relationships between parts of documents of a first kind and associated parts of documents of a second kind, to thereby provide a modified translation file, such as creating a BizTalk map that associates the fields of the first document to the related fields of the second document, creating an XSLT translation file (See Adams, Pages 109-123).

Adams also teaches runtime logic configured to convert the input document into the output document using the modified translation file, including activating the mapping functionality by testing the BizTalk map with entered data values (See Adams, Page 125), and using the mapping functionality to provide references in the output document that associate parts of the output document with parts of the input document, such as a

reference associated a student score percent in an input document with a student grade percent in an output document (See Adams, Page 125, Figure 5.18).

Adams does not teach expressly providing a translation file that converts document of the first kind to documents of the second kind (emphasis added), or including storage to receive the modified translation file.

Vasters teaches that Microsoft BizTalk Mapper is used to transform documents in a native format (See Vasters, Page 360, "BizTalk Mapper"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include separate kinds of documents to be transformed, providing the benefit of allowing related data to be exchanged among applications requiring different data types.

Vasters also teaches saving the translation file to a storage by prompting the user to save the translation file before testing the map (See Vasters, Page 367, Figure 16-7)

Adams and Vasters are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of mapping documents using Microsoft BizTalk Mapper.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the saving of a translation file and the conversion of different types of documents of Vasters with the document translation method of Adams. The motivation for doing so would have been to retain the translation file for future use, and to allow the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different

document standard or schema. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vasters with Adams for the benefit of retaining the translation file for future and allowing the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

As per dependent claim 18, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Claim 18 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 2 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 2.

As per dependent claim 19, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 18 as described above. Claim 18 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 3 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 3.

As per dependent claim 20, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Claim 20 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 4 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 4.

As per dependent claim 21, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 20 as described above. Claim 21 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 5 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 5.

As per dependent claim 22, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Claim 22 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 6 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 6.

As per dependent claim 23, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 22 as described above. Claim 23 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 7 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 7.

As per dependent claim 24, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Claim 24 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 8 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 8.

As per dependent claim 25, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 24 as described above. Claim 25 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 9 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 9.

As per dependent claim 26, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 25 as described above. Claim 26 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 10 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 10.

As per dependent claim 27, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Claim 27 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject

matter as that of claim 11 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 11.

As per dependent claim 28, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 17 as described above. Claim 28 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 12 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 12.

As per independent claim 29, Adams teaches a computer readable medium, such as a BizTalk Server, having machine readable instructions for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document (See Adams, Pages 110-112, including Figure 5.1). Claim 29 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 17 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 17.

As per independent claim 30, Adams teaches an apparatus for mapping between parts of an input document and associated parts of an output document (See Adams, Pages 110-112, including Figure 5.1). Claim 30 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 1 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 1.

As per independent claim 31, Adams teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon an information structure, such as the BizTalk Server containing the BizTalk Mapper application (See Adams, Pages 110-112), including a number of functions interspersed amongst the number of translation elements, the functions configured to provide a respective number of references, where the references provide

pointers that link parts of a second kind of document with parts of a first kind of document, such as the Microsoft BizTalk Mapper application that includes mapping functions allowing a user to create references between data elements of an input document with data elements of an output document including providing pointers to link the elements of the input document to the related elements of the output document (See Adams, Pages 109-125, and Figure 5.18).

Adams does not teach expressly providing a translation file that converts document of the first kind to documents of the second kind (emphasis added).

Vasters teaches that Microsoft BizTalk Mapper is used to transform documents in a native format (See Vasters, Page 360, "BizTalk Mapper"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include separate kinds of documents to be transformed, providing the benefit of allowing related data to be exchanged among applications requiring different data types.

Adams and Vasters are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of mapping documents using Microsoft BizTalk Mapper.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the conversion of different types of documents of Vasters with the document translation method of Adams. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Vasters with Adams for the benefit of allowing the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

As per dependent claim 32, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Claim 32 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 11 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 11.

As per dependent claim 33, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 31 as described above. Claim 33 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 12 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 12.

As per independent claim 34, Adams teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon an information structure, such as the BizTalk Server containing the BizTalk Mapper application (See Adams, Pages 110-112), including a number of references interspersed amongst the number of translation elements, the references providing pointers that link the respective parts of a second document with parts of a first document, such as the Microsoft BizTalk Mapper application that includes mapping functions allowing a user to create references between data elements of an input document with data elements of an output document including providing pointers to link

the elements of the input document to the related elements of the output document (See Adams, Pages 109-125, and Figure 5.18).

Adams does not teach expressly providing a translation file that converts document of the first kind to documents of the second kind (emphasis added).

Vasters teaches that Microsoft BizTalk Mapper is used to transform documents in a native format (See Vasters, Page 360, "BizTalk Mapper"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include separate kinds of documents to be transformed, providing the benefit of allowing related data to be exchanged among applications requiring different data types.

Adams and Vasters are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of mapping documents using Microsoft BizTalk Mapper.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the conversion of different types of documents of Vasters with the document translation method of Adams. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Vasters with Adams for the benefit of allowing the sharing of data created using different document standards and schemas such that the sending and receiving applications may retain the data in the native format while transforming the contents of

the documents to include the data created using a different document standard or schema to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

As per dependent claim 35, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 34 as described above. Claim 35 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 11 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 11.

As per dependent claim 36, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 34 as described above. Claim 36 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 12 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 12.

As per dependent claim 38, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches the use of XSLT to transform documents (See Adams, Pages 45-49). Applicants admit that a prior art translation file, such as XSLT, "is expressed in an arbitrary format." (See Instant Specification, Page 12, lines 7-15).

As per dependent claim 39, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the modifying may be performed automatically (See Adams, Page 110, "Transforming Data Between Documents").

As per dependent claim 51, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the translation file is expressed in XSL and is sufficient in an unmodified state to convert documents of the first kind to documents of the second kind, such as by performing a direct mapping of the input

document to the output document without specifying transformation references (See Adams, Pages 45-49, and Page 115).

As per dependent claim 52, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Claim 52 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claims 3 and 5 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claims 3 and 5.

As per dependent claim 53, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 51 as described above. Adams also teaches that the translation file is not sufficient in an unmodified state to return the references that associate the parts of the output document with the parts of the input document, such as including the need to add functoids to precipitate the transformation of elements of the input document to related elements of the output document (See Adams, Page 114, Figure 5.4).

As per dependent claim 54, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches adding mapping functionality at locations at which predetermined instructions occur in the translation file (See Adams, Page 112 and Figure 5.2).

As per dependent claim 55, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the modifying of the translation file includes automatically adding mapping functionality to the translation file (See Adams, Page 110, "Transforming Data Between Documents") and manually modifying the translation file in a circumstance in which the automatic adding is not sufficient (See Adams, Page 115, "Using Functoids to Transform Data").

As per dependent claim 56, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Claim 56 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claims 11 and 12 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claims 11 and 12.

As per dependent claim 57, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Claim 57 additionally incorporates substantially similar subject matter as that of claim 10 above, and is additionally rejected along the same rationale as used in the rejection of claim 10.

As per dependent claim 58, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 57 as described above. Adams also teaches that the translation file is expressed in XSL and where the mapping functions include extension functions that extend functionality provided in XSL (See Adams, Pages 45-49, and Page 115, "Using Functoids to Transform Data").

As per dependent claim 59, Adams and Vasters teach the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Adams also teaches that the first phase is performed once and the second phase is performed for each conversion of a particular input document of the first kind to a particular output document of the second kind (See Adams, Page 126, "Testing With a Source Instance").

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 15, 17-36, 38-39, and 51-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Sahota (U.S. Publication 2005/0114757 A1) discloses a method and system for transforming content for execution on multiple platforms.
- Sukehiro (U.S. Publication 2004/0205671 A1) discloses a natural language processing system.
- Helgeson (U.S. Patent 6,643,652 B2) discloses a method and apparatus for managing data exchange among systems in a network.
- Anat discloses integrating and customizing heterogeneous E-Commerce applications.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Laurie Ries
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176